

JUDGES TABLE OF CONTENTS

Who Judges the Judges	PAGE 44
Statewide Arizona Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal	
Judges Summary – Appellate Courts	PAGE 45
Judges Details – Appellate Courts	PAGE 46
Trial Courts by County	
Judges Summary – Pinal County Superior Court	PAGE 48
Judges Details – Pinal County Superior Court	PAGE 49
Judges Summary – Pima County Superior Court	PAGE 51
Judges Details – Pima County Superior Court	PAGE 52
Judges Summary – Maricopa County Superior Court	PAGE 55
Judges Details – Maricopa County Superior Court	PAGE 58
JPR Voter Checklist	PAGE 76



WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES? YOU DO! WE CAN HELP.

Voters! Finish the Ballot!

Use the following summary and report by the Commission on Judicial Performance Review (JPR) to Finish the Ballot! The JPR Commission was established by voters to evaluate judges' performance during retention elections. While judges initially are appointed, this report can help you decide whether these judges meet judicial performance standards and should be retained. Which judges appear on your ballot depends on your county and the court on which the judge serves. By using this report to finish your ballot, you will help ensure Arizona's strong and impartial judiciary!

Some Arizona judges are appointed through Merit Selection and rated by the JPR Commission. Merit Selection and Retention

In 1974, Arizona voters decided that for Arizona's Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and Superior Courts in counties with populations over 250,000 (currently Maricopa, Pima, and Pinal) judges would be appointed by the Governor from a list of qualified candidates. The Arizona Constitution directs commissions to nominate candidates based primarily on their merit, with consideration given to the diversity of Arizona's population. Arizona voters then periodically vote whether to retain these judges as their terms expire. This system is known as Merit Selection and Retention.

JPR Commission Evaluations & Report

Created by a constitutional amendment, the 30-member JPR Commission conducts standards-based performance evaluations of judges. Most of the JPR Commissioners are public members, not lawyers or judges. JPR reports its results to the public. This report provides JPR Commission findings, survey results, and states whether each judge in a retention election "meets" or "fails to meet" judicial performance standards.

Judicial Performance Standards

The JPR Commission evaluates each judge up for retention election to assess the judge's:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

Public Input Throughout the Process

This year, as every election year, the JPR Commission sought public input from citizens who have had direct experience with judges and made its decisions using that input. In 2013, 60,000 surveys on judges were distributed to attorneys, jurors, litigants and witnesses. The JPR Commission held public hearings open to anyone wishing to speak about the judges up for retention this year. The JPR Commission accepts signed, written comments about meritappointed judges at any time.

Use JPR Results and Checklist

Every Voter can take an active role in this judicial review process. Use this JPR summary and report to guide your votes for judges up for retention. After reviewing a judge's information, mark "Yes" or "No" next to the judge's name on the Judges Checklist tear-off sheet in this pamphlet. Refer to your checklist to **Finish Your Ballot!**

Visit <u>www.AZJudges.info</u> for more information.

Contact the Commission on Judicial Performance Review: (602) 452-3311

or email <u>ipr@courts.az.gov</u>

Report of the Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories.

Judicial Performance Standards include:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- · Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES AND JUDGES

Garye L. Vasquez

The following judges DO NOT MEET Judicial Performance Standards

NONE

The following judges MEET Judicial Performance Standards

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT:

Scott Bales

Robert Brutinel

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE: COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO:

Andrew W. Gould

Randall M. Howe

Diane M. Johnsen

Patricia A. Orozco

Samuel A. Thumma

Judge	JPR Votes "Meets" Judicial Standards	JPR Votes "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Did Not Vote	JPR Commission Member Did Not Vote on Self	Details JPR Page
Bales, Scott	29	0	0	0	46
Brutinel, Robert	29	0	0	0	46
Gould, Andrew	29	0	0	0	46
Howe, Randall	29	0	0	0	46
Johnsen, Diane	29	0	0	0	47
Orozco, Patricia	29	0	0	0	47
Thumma, Samuel	29	0	0	0	47
Vasquez, Garye	27	0	2	0	47

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

BALES, SCOTT	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SION RESULTS	
Appointed to	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J		
Supreme Court: 2005	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not	t Meet" Judicial Star	ndards
		<u>Attorney</u>	Superior Court
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Judge Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	95%	100%
	Integrity	96%	100%
	Communication Skills	98%	N/A
	Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%
BRUTINEL, ROBERT	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS	
Appointed to	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J		
Supreme Court: 2011	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	t Meet" Judicial Sta	ndards
		<u>Attorney</u>	Superior Court
	Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Judge Responses
	Legal Ability	90%	100%
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	97%	N/A
	Judicial Temperament	99%	N/A
	Administrative Performance	90%	100%
GOULD, ANDREW	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No		ndarde
Appeals Division 1. 2012	o commissioners voted bots no	Attorney	Superior Court
	Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Judge Responses
	Legal Ability	89%	99%
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	98%	N/A
	Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A
	Administrative Performance	94%	100%
HOWE, RANDALL	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS	
Appointed to Court of	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"		
Appeals Division I: 2012	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No		ndards
		Attorney	Superior Court
	Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Judge Responses
	Legal Ability	94%	100%
	g · ·~···		
	Integrity	100%	100%
	Integrity Communication Skills	100% 100%	100% N/A

94%

100%

Administrative Performance

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS				
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards				
Appeals Division 1: 2006	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	t Meet" Judicial Stan	dards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	Superior Court		
<u>J</u>	<u>udicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	Judge Responses		
L	egal Ability	89%	94%		
Ir	ntegrity	98%	90%		
C	Communication Skills	98%	N/A		
J	udicial Temperament	98%	N/A		
А	Administrative Performance	94%	95%		
OROZCO, PATRICIA	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS			
Appointed to Court of	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J				
Appeals Division 1: 2004	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	t Meet" Judicial Stand	dards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	Superior Court		
<u>J</u>	<u>udicial Performance Surveys</u>	Responses	Judge Responses		
L	egal Ability	89%	97%		
	ntegrity	98%	98%		
	Communication Skills	98%	N/A		
J	udicial Temperament	99%	N/A		
А	Administrative Performance	91%	100%		
	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS OF Commissioners Voted "Meets"				
	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	udicial Standards	dards		
Appointed to Court of	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J	udicial Standards	dards Superior Court		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand			
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand <u>Attorney</u>	Superior Court		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand <u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	Superior Court Judge Responses		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Learning Lear	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84%	Superior Court Judge Responses 100%		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Logon Court of Appeals Division I: 2012	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability htegrity	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100%	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100%		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July 100	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability httegrity communication Skills	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99%	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Appeals Division I: 2012 Luly Appeals Division I: 2012	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability ntegrity communication Skills udicial Temperament dministrative Performance	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99% 100% 96%	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A N/A		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Appeals Division I: 2012 Lugar Appear VASQUEZ, GARYE	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability ntegrity communication Skills udicial Temperament dministrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99% 100% 96% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A N/A 100%		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Amount of Appeals Division I: 2012 Luly Amount of Appeals Division I: 2012	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability ntegrity communication Skills udicial Temperament dministrative Performance	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99% 100% 96% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A N/A 100%		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Land Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 VASQUEZ, GARYE Appointed to Court of 2	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability ntegrity communication Skills udicial Temperament dministrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99% 100% 96% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A N/A 100%		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Land In Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 VASQUEZ, GARYE Appointed to Court of 2	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability integrity communication Skills udicial Temperament dministrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99% 100% 96% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A N/A 100%		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Log A VASQUEZ, GARYE Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2006	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability integrity communication Skills udicial Temperament dministrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99% 100% 96% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A N/A 100%		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 June 2 VASQUEZ, GARYE Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2006	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability ntegrity communication Skills udicial Temperament dministrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No 2 Commissioners Did Not Vote udicial Performance Surveys	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99% 100% 96% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A N/A 100% dards Superior Court Judge Responses		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Asquez, Garye Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2006 July Asquez, Garye Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2006	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability integrity communication Skills udicial Temperament dministrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No 2 Commissioners Did Not Vote udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99% 100% 96% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A N/A 100% dards Superior Court		
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012 July Asquez, Garye Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2006 July Asquez, Garye Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2006	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No udicial Performance Surveys egal Ability ntegrity communication Skills udicial Temperament dministrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No 2 Commissioners Did Not Vote udicial Performance Surveys	udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 84% 100% 99% 100% 96% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 88%	Superior Court Judge Responses 100% 100% N/A N/A 100% dards Superior Court Judge Responses 97%		

99%

Administrative Performance

98%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories.

Judicial Performance Standards include:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- · Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE PINAL COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

The following judges DO NOT MEET Judicial Performance Standards

NONE

The following judges MEET Judicial Performance Standards

Gilberto V. Figueroa Daniel A. Washburn Steven J. Fuller Kevin D. White Brenda E. Oldham

Judge	JPR Votes "Meets" Judicial Standards	JPR Votes "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Did Not Vote	JPR Commission Member Did Not Vote on Self	Details JPR Page
Figueroa, Gilberto	29	0	0	0	49
Fuller, Steven	29	0	0	0	49
Oldham, Brenda	29	0	0	0	49
Washburn, Daniel	27	1	1	0	49
White, Kevin	28	1	0	0	50

Reading This Data

FIGUEDOA OU DEDTO					
FIGUEROA, GILBERTO	='				
Elected to Pinal County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J				
Superior Court: 1998	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards				
		<u>Attorney</u>	Litigant/Witness		
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>		
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A		
	Integrity	97%	100%		
	Communication Skills	97%	100%		
	Judicial Temperament	95%	100%		
	Administrative Performance	98%	100%		
FULLER, STEVEN	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS			
Elected to Pinal County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J	udicial Standards			
Superior Court: 2011	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	t Meet" Judicial Stand	dards		
		Attorney	Litigant/Witness		
	Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Responses		
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A		
	Integrity	99%	84%		
	Communication Skills	100%	74%		
	Judicial Temperament	93%	71%		
	Administrative Performance	100%	83%		
OLDHAM, BRENDA	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS			
Elected to Pinal County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J	udicial Standards			
Elected to Pinal County Superior Court: 2007	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No		dards		
•			dards <u>Litigant/Witness</u>		
•		t Meet" Judicial Stand			
•	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	t Meet" Judicial Stand <u>Attorney</u>	Litigant/Witness		
•	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity	t Meet" Judicial Stand <u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>		
•	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability	t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95%	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u> N/A 100% 94%		
•	O Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament	t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 93% 96%	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u> N/A 100%		
•	O Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills	t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95%	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u> N/A 100% 94%		
•	O Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament	t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93%	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95%		
Superior Court: 2007	O Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J	Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93% 93% 93% Using the standards	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95% 93%		
Superior Court: 2007 WASHBURN, DANIEL Elected to Pinal County	O Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 1 Commissioners Voted "Does No	Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93% 93% 93% Using the standards	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95% 93%		
Superior Court: 2007 WASHBURN, DANIEL Elected to Pinal County	O Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J	Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93% 93% 93% Using the standards	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95% 93%		
Superior Court: 2007 WASHBURN, DANIEL Elected to Pinal County	O Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 1 Commissioners Voted "Does No	Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93% 93% 93% Using the standards	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95% 93%		
Superior Court: 2007 WASHBURN, DANIEL Elected to Pinal County	O Commissioners Voted "Does No Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 1 Commissioners Voted "Does No	Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93% 93% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95% 93%		
Superior Court: 2007 WASHBURN, DANIEL Elected to Pinal County	Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 1 Commissioners Voted "Does No 1 Commissioner Did Not Vote Judicial Performance Surveys	t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93% 93% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95% 93% dards Litigant/Witness		
Superior Court: 2007 WASHBURN, DANIEL Elected to Pinal County	Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 1 Commissioners Voted "Does No 1 Commissioner Did Not Vote Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability	Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 86%	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95% 93% dards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A		
Superior Court: 2007 WASHBURN, DANIEL Elected to Pinal County	Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 1 Commissioners Voted "Does No 1 Commissioner Did Not Vote Judicial Performance Surveys	Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95% 93% dards Litigant/Witness Responses		
Superior Court: 2007 WASHBURN, DANIEL	Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 1 Commissioners Voted "Does No 1 Commissioner Did Not Vote Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity	Attorney Responses 93% 96% 95% 93% 93% SSION RESULTS udicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Stand Attorney Responses 86% 97%	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 94% 95% 93% dards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 95%		

Reading This Data

WHITE, KEVIN Elected to Pinal County Superior Court: 2005	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 1 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards			
	Attorney Litigant/Witness			
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>	
	Legal Ability 83% N/A			
	Integrity	87%	100%	
	Communication Skills	76%	100%	
	Judicial Temperament	75%	100%	
	Administrative Performance	69%	100%	

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories.

Judicial Performance Standards include:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

The following judges DO NOT MEET Judicial Performance Standards

Catherine M. Woods

The following judges MEET Judicial Performance Standards

Jeffrey T. Bergin Christopher Browning Javier Chon-Lopez Charles Harrington Danelle B. Liwski James E. Marner Richard D. Nichols Kathleen A. Quigley Kenneth C. Stanford

Judge	JPR Votes "Meets" Judicial Standards	JPR Votes "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Did Not Vote	JPR Commission Member Did Not Vote on Self	Details JPR Page
Bergin, Jeffrey	29	0	0	0	52
Browning, Christopher	29	0	0	0	52
Chon-Lopez, Javier	29	0	0	0	52
Harrington, Charles	29	0	0	0	52
Liwski, Danelle	29	0	0	0	53
Marner, James	29	0	0	0	53
Nichols, Richard	29	0	0	0	53
Quigley, Kathleen	29	0	0	0	53
Stanford, Kenneth	29	0	0	0	54
Woods, Catherine	7	22	0	0	54

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

BERGIN, JEFFREY Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	Judicial Standards	andards
		<u>Attorney</u>	Litigant/Witness
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	98%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	100%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	100%	100%
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%
BROWNING, CHRISTOPHEI Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1998	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	Judicial Standards	andards
		<u>Attorney</u>	Litigant/Witness
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	93%	98%
	Communication Skills	96%	97%
	Judicial Temperament	90%	98%
	Administrative Performance	99%	98%
CHON-LOPEZ, JAVIER Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	Judicial Standards	andards
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"	Judicial Standards	andards <u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"	Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial St <u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial St Attorney Responses 87%	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u> N/A
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "	Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial St Attorney Responses 87% 100%	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial St Attorney Responses 87% 100% 91%	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100%
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial St Attorney Responses 87% 100% 91% 96%	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100% 100%
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial St Attorney Responses 87% 100% 91%	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100%
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial St Attorney Responses 87% 100% 91% 96% 82% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100% 100%
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2007 HARRINGTON, CHARLES Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Meets" 1 Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards Attorney Responses 87% 100% 91% 96% 82% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial St	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100% 100% 100% Litigant/Witness
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2007 HARRINGTON, CHARLES Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does Noted "Does Noted "Does Noted "Does Noted "Meets" Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards 87% 100% 91% 96% 82% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100% 100% 100% andards Litigant/Witness Responses
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2007 HARRINGTON, CHARLES Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Meets" 1 UDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 1 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does No	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards 87% 100% 91% 96% 82% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards of Meet Meet Meet Meet Meet Meet Meet Mee	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100% 100% 100% andards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2007 HARRINGTON, CHARLES Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards 87% 100% 91% 96% 82% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Jud	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100% 100% 100% andards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 96%
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2007 HARRINGTON, CHARLES Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Meets" 1 UDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 1 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does No	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards 87% 100% 91% 96% 82% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards 98% 99% 98%	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100% 100% 100% andards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 96% 97%
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2007 HARRINGTON, CHARLES Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "	Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards 87% 100% 91% 96% 82% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Jud	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 99% 100% 100% 100% andards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 96%

99%

100%

Administrative Performance

Reading This Data

LIWSKI, DANELLE	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS			
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J				
Superior Court: 2011		0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards			
		Attorney	Litigant/Witness		
	Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Responses		
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A		
	Integrity	90%	86%		
	Communication Skills	90%	82%		
	Judicial Temperament	94%	82%		
	Administrative Performance	97%	97%		
MARNER, JAMES	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS				
Appointed to Pima County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J		n doudo		
Superior Court: 2012	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No				
	lo Patal Bastana C	Attorney	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>		
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A		
	Integrity	99%	100%		
	Communication Skills	99%	100%		
	Judicial Temperament	98%	100%		
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%		
NICHOLS, RICHARD Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J				
Superior Court: 1995	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No		ndards		
•	L	Attorney	Litigant/Witness		
	Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Responses		
	Legal Ability	94%	 N/A		
	Integrity	98%	97%		
	Communication Skills	96%	96%		
	Judicial Temperament	97%	98%		
	Administrative Performance	99%	98%		
OUIGLEY KATHLEEN			98%		
QUIGLEY, KATHLEEN Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS	98%		
Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"	SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards			
Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Sta	ndards		
Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" of Commissioners Voted "Does No	SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Sta <u>Attorney</u>	ndards <u>Litigant/Witness</u>		
Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" of Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does No	SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Sta <u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	ndards <u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>		
QUIGLEY, KATHLEEN Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" of Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does No	SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Sta Attorney Responses 100%	ndards <u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u> N/A		
Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" of Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does Noted Indicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity	SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Sta Attorney Responses 100% 99%	ndards <u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u> N/A 100%		
Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" of Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does No	SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Standards Attorney Responses 100% 99% 100%	ndards <u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u> N/A 100% 100%		
Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" of Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does Noted Indicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity	SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards of Meet" Judicial Sta Attorney Responses 100% 99%	ndards <u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u> N/A 100%		

Reading This Data

STANFORD, KENNETH Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards				
	Indiaial Barfarmana Communi	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>		
	Legal Ability	88%	N/A		
	Integrity	93%	100%		
	Communication Skills	93%	100%		
	Judicial Temperament	93%	100%		
	Administrative Performance	99%	95%		
WOODS, CATHERINE Appointed to Pima County	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 7 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 22 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards				
Superior Court: 2011			dards		
			dards <u>Litigant/Witness</u>		
		Meet" Judicial Stan			
	22 Commissioners Voted "Does Not	Meet" Judicial Stan	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>		
	22 Commissioners Voted "Does Not <u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	Meet" Judicial Stan <u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>		
	22 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability	Meet" Judicial Stan Attorney Responses 80%	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u> N/A		
1	22 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability Integrity	Meet" Judicial Stan Attorney Responses 80% 88%	Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100%		

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories.

Judicial Performance Standards include:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- · Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

The following judges DO NOT MEET Judicial Performance Standards

Benjamin R. Norris

The following judges MEET Judicial Performance Standards

MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT:

Mark F. Aceto Aimee L. Anderson Arthur T. Anderson Bradley Astrowsky Cynthia J. Bailey Janet E. Barton Edward W. Bassett Dawn M. Bergin James T. Blomo Mark H. Brain Roger E. Brodman William L. Brotherton Katherine M. Cooper Janice K. Crawford David O. Cunanan Norman J. Davis Sally S. Duncan Boyd W. Dunn Alfred M. Fenzel

Dean M. Fink George H. Foster, Jr. J. Richard Gama Warren J. Granville Hugh E. Hegyi Michael J. Herrod Bethany G. Hicks Carey S. Hyatt Brian K. Ishikawa Joseph C. Kreamer Daniel G. Martin Rosa P. Mroz Samuel J. Myers Karen L. O'Connor Susanna C. Pineda

Jay Polk Gerald J. Porter John C. Rea Peter C. Reinstein Emmet J. Ronan Joan M. Sinclair

Pamela Hearn Svoboda David M. Talamante Danielle J. Viola Randall H. Warner Joseph C. Welty Eileen S. Willett

		illiation visit. ww		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1
	JPR Votes	JPR Votes	Did	JPR Commission	Details
Judge	"Meets" Judicial Standards	"Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Not Vote	Member Did Not Vote on Self	JPR Page
Acata Mark					50
Aceto, Mark	29	0	0	0	58
Anderson, Aimee	29	0	0	0	58
Anderson, Arthur	29	0	0	0	58
Astrowsky, Bradley	25	4	0	0	58
Bailey, Cynthia	29	0	0	0	59
Barton, Janet	29	0	0	0	59
Bassett, Edward	29	0	0	0	59
Bergin, Dawn	29	0	0	0	59
Blomo, James	29	0	0	0	60
Brain, Mark	29	0	0	0	60
Brodman, Roger	29	0	0	0	60
Brotherton, William	28	1	0	0	60
Cooper, Katherine	29	0	0	0	61
Crawford, Janice	29	0	0	0	61
Cunanan, David	29	0	0	0	61
Davis, Norman	29	0	0	0	61
Duncan, Sally	29	0	0	0	62
Dunn, Boyd	29	0	0	0	62
Fenzel, Alfred	29	0	0	0	62
Fink, Dean	29	0	0	0	62
Foster, George	28	0	0	1	63
Gama, J. Richard	29	0	0	0	63
Granville, Warren	29	0	0	0	63
Hegyi, Hugh	29	0	0	0	63
Herrod, Michael	29	0	0	0	64
Hicks, Bethany	29	0	0	0	64
Hyatt, Carey	29	0	0	0	64
Ishikawa, Brian	29	0	0	0	64
Kreamer, Joseph	29	0	0	0	65
Martin, Daniel	29	0	0	0	65
Mroz, Rosa	29	0	0	0	65
Myers, Samuel	29	0	0	0	65
Norris, Benjamin	3	25	1	0	66
O'Connor, Karen	29	0	0	0	66
Pineda, Susanna	29	0	0	0	66
Polk, Jay	29	0	0	0	66
<u>*</u>					
Porter, Gerald	18	11	0	0	67
Rea, John	29	0	0	0	67
Reinstein, Peter	28	1	0	0	67

JUDGES - SUMMARY - MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT General Election ~ November 4, 2014

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info

Judge	JPR Votes "Meets" Judicial Standards	JPR Votes "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Did Not Vote	JPR Commission Member Did Not Vote on Self	Details JPR Page
Ronan, Emmet	29	0	0	0	67
Sinclair, Joan	29	0	0	0	68
Svoboda, Pamela	29	0	0	0	68
Talamante, David	29	0	0	0	68
Viola, Danielle	29	0	0	0	68
Warner, Randall	29	0	0	0	69
Welty, Joseph	29	0	0	0	69
Willett, Eileen	29	0	0	0	69

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

ACETO, MARK Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	96%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	97%
	Communication Skills	98%	92%
	Judicial Temperament	97%	95%
	Administrative Performance	99%	98%

ANDERSON, AIMEE Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS
29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A
Integrity	100%	84%
Communication Skills	97%	75%
Judicial Temperament	92%	80%

93%

76%

ANDERSON, ARTHUR Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS
29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

Administrative Performance

Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/witness</u> <u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	90%	 N/A
Integrity	96%	100%
Communication Skills	91%	100%
Judicial Temperament	90%	100%
Administrative Performance	88%	100%

ASTROWSKY, BRADLEY Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2012

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

25 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
4 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	92%	N/A
Integrity	92%	100%
Communication Skills	91%	100%
Judicial Temperament	77%	100%
Administrative Performance	83%	100%

JUDGES - DETAILS - MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

Reading This Data

BAILEY, CYNTHIA	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI	SSION RESULTS	
Appointed to Maricopa	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
County Superior Court: 2011	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
•		Attorney	Litigant/Witness
	Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Responses
	Legal Ability	96%	N/A
	Integrity	96%	100%
	Communication Skills	96%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	93%	100%
	Administrative Performance	98%	100%
BARTON, JANET	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI	SSION RESULTS	
Appointed to Maricopa	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"		
County Superior Court: 2000	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No		ndards
223.11, 2325.101 20411. 2000	2 2020.0	Attorney	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	Responses
	· ·	100%	N/A
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A 0%
	Integrity Communication Skills	100%	0%
	Judicial Temperament	93%	0%
	Administrative Performance	100%	0%
	Administrative Ferrormance	100 /0	0 /0
BASSETT, EDWARD	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI		
Appointed to Maricopa	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
County Superior Court: 2008	0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	ot Meet" Judicial Sta	ındards
	•	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
		- 1110 - 110 - 1	
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	Responses
	Judicial Performance Surveys Legal Ability		_
	-	Responses	Responses
	Legal Ability	Responses 95%	Responses N/A
	Legal Ability Integrity	<u>Responses</u> 95% 100%	Responses N/A 94%
	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills	Responses 95% 100% 100%	Responses N/A 94% 87%
BERGIN, DAWN	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance	Responses 95% 100% 100% 96% 100%	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94%
BERGIN, DAWN Appointed to Maricopa	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI	Responses 95% 100% 100% 96% 100%	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94%
Appointed to Maricopa	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"	95% 100% 100% 96% 100% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94% 97%
	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI	Responses 95% 100% 100% 96% 100% ISSION RESULTS Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial Sta	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94% 97%
Appointed to Maricopa	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	Responses 95% 100% 100% 96% 100% ISSION RESULTS Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial Sta	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94% 97% Indards Litigant/Witness
Appointed to Maricopa	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	Responses 95% 100% 100% 96% 100% ISSION RESULTS Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial Sta Attorney Responses	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94% 97% Indards Litigant/Witness Responses
Appointed to Maricopa	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted "Does Noted Des Note	Responses 95% 100% 100% 96% 100% ISSION RESULTS Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial Sta Attorney Responses 90%	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94% 97% Indards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A
Appointed to Maricopa	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted	Responses 95% 100% 100% 96% 100% ISSION RESULTS Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial Sta Attorney Responses 90% 99%	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94% 97% nndards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100%
Appointed to Maricopa	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted	Responses 95% 100% 100% 96% 100% ISSION RESULTS Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial Sta Attorney Responses 90% 99% 93%	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94% 97% nndards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100% 100%
Appointed to Maricopa	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMI 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Noted	Responses 95% 100% 100% 96% 100% ISSION RESULTS Judicial Standards ot Meet" Judicial Sta Attorney Responses 90% 99%	Responses N/A 94% 87% 94% 97% andards Litigant/Witness Responses N/A 100%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

BLOMO, JAMES	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
Appointed to Maricopa County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
Superior Court: 2011	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	96%	100%
	Communication Skills	90%	98%
	Judicial Temperament	76%	99%
	Administrative Performance	89%	99%

BRAIN, MARK Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS
29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards

0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	92%	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%

BRODMAN, ROGER Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards

0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u> Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A
Integrity	98%	92%
Communication Skills	96%	94%
Judicial Temperament	96%	87%
Administrative Performance	99%	89%

BROTHERTON, WILLIAM

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards

1 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	88%	N/A
Integrity	90%	95%
Communication Skills	89%	97%
Judicial Temperament	74%	99%
Administrative Performance	95%	98%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

COOPER, CATHERINE Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	93%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	98%
	Communication Skills	92%	83%
	Judicial Temperament	98%	88%
	Administrative Performance	98%	92%

CRAWFORD, JANICE Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS
29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A
Integrity	99%	88%
Communication Skills	97%	86%
Judicial Temperament	98%	80%
Administrative Performance	99%	82%

CUNANAN, DAVID

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2012

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS
29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards

0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	92%	N/A
Integrity	96%	97%
Communication Skills	88%	75%
Judicial Temperament	92%	75%
Administrative Performance	96%	79%

DAVIS, NORMAN JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS Appointed to Maricopa County Superior 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards Court: 1995 **0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards** Judicial Performance Surveys All Respondents Judge Davis is the Maricopa County Presiding Legal Ability N/A 97% Judge and was reviewed on administrative Integrity 98% Communication Skills duties. **Judicial Temperament** 98% Administrative Performance 98%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

DUNCAN, SALLY	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
Appointed to Maricopa County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
Superior Court: 2004	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	Litigant/Witness
	Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	92%	N/A
	Integrity	95%	95%
	Communication Skills	90%	67%
	Judicial Temperament	93%	90%
	Administrative Performance	94%	76%
<u> </u>			

DUNN, BOYD Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u> Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	90%	N/A
Integrity	90%	90%
Communication Skills	84%	91%
Judicial Temperament	84%	89%
Administrative Performance	84%	88%

FENZEL, ALFRED

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

Judicial Performance Surveys	Attorney Responses	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	100%
Judicial Temperament	95%	100%
Administrative Performance	97%	100%

FINK, DEAN

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards

0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	93%	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

FOSTER, JR., GEORGE

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
- **0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards**
- 1 JPR Commission Member-Did Not Vote on Self

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Responses
Legal Ability	89%	N/A
Integrity	94%	79%
Communication Skills	86%	68%
Judicial Temperament	86%	74%
Administrative Performance	91%	73%

GAMA, J. RICHARD

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
- 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u> Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%
Administrative Performance	95%	100%

GRANVILLE, WARREN

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
- **0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards**

	<u> Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Responses
Legal Ability	99%	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	97%

HEGYI, HUGH

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
 - 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	77%	N/A
Integrity	97%	94%
Communication Skills	86%	78%
Judicial Temperament	86%	82%
Administrative Performance	90%	78%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

HERROD, MICHAEL JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS Appointed to Maricopa County 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards Superior Court: 2011 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards Litigant/Witness Attorney Judicial Performance Surveys Responses Responses Legal Ability 95% N/A Integrity 98% 100% Communication Skills 96% 100% Judicial Temperament 100% 99% Administrative Performance 97% 100%

HICKS, BETHANY Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u> Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A
Integrity	95%	90%
Communication Skills	94%	88%
Judicial Temperament	95%	91%
Administrative Performance	98%	93%

HYATT, CAREY

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
- 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u> Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A
Integrity	98%	98%
Communication Skills	94%	100%
Judicial Temperament	92%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%

ISHIKAWA, BRIAN

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
- 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Attorney</u> Responses	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> Responses
Legal Ability	95%	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	99%
Judicial Temperament	98%	99%
Administrative Performance	97%	100%

100%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info

Reading This Data

MYERS, SAMUEL

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

KREAMER, JOSEPH Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	96%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	100%
	Communication Skills	100%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%
MARTIN DANIEL	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMM	ISSION RESULTS	_

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	Judicial Parformance Surveye	Attorney	Litigant/Witness
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	90%	N/A
	Integrity	90%	100%
	Communication Skills	91%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	91%	100%
	Administrative Performance	94%	100%

MROZ, ROSA Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	100%
	Communication Skills	99%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	97%	100%

Administrative Performance

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	Litigant/Witness
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	97%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	99%
	Communication Skills	96%	96%
	Judicial Temperament	100%	96%
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

100%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

NORRIS, BENJAMIN

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2008

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 3 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
- 25 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards
- 1 Commissioner Did Not Vote

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	Responses	Responses
Legal Ability	75%	N/A
Integrity	87%	93%
Communication Skills	67%	86%
Judicial Temperament	59%	89%
Administrative Performance	84%	90%

O'CONNOR, KAREN

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
- 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	92%	N/A
Integrity	91%	100%
Communication Skills	94%	100%
Judicial Temperament	94%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%

PINEDA, SUSANNA

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
- **0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards**

	Attorney	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	86%	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%
Administrative Performance	90%	100%

POLK, JAY

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

- 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
- 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/</u> <u>Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A
Integrity	98%	88%
Communication Skills	94%	80%
Judicial Temperament	94%	73%
Administrative Performance	96%	67%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

PORTER, GERALD Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 18 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 11 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> <u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	93%	N/A
	Integrity	96%	77%
	Communication Skills	88%	66%
	Judicial Temperament	90%	66%
	Administrative Performance	95%	70%
REA, JOHN	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS	

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	97%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	100%
	Communication Skills	98%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%

<u>REINSTEIN, PETER</u>
Appointed to Maricopa
County Superior Court: 1998

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS
28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
1 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A
Integrity	92%	98%
Communication Skills	89%	86%
Judicial Temperament	80%	89%
Administrative Performance	94%	88%

RONAN, EMMET Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS
29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

Litigant/Witness Attorney Judicial Performance Surveys Responses Responses Legal Ability N/A 96% Integrity 98% 99% Communication Skills 96% 96% Judicial Temperament 97% 99% Administrative Performance 96% 97%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

SINCLAIR, JOAN Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Attorney</u> Responses	<u>Litigant/Witness</u> Responses
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	98%	98%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	98%
	Administrative Performance	84%	99%

SVOBODA, PAMELA Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2012

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS
29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A
Integrity	100%	92%
Communication Skills	100%	92%
Judicial Temperament	100%	92%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%

<u>TALAMANTE, DAVID</u>

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999 JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS
29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards

0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A
Integrity	96%	92%
Communication Skills	94%	86%
Judicial Temperament	96%	89%
Administrative Performance	98%	91%

VIOLA, DANIELLE

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards

0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards

	<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
Judicial Performance Surveys	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A
Integrity	98%	83%
Communication Skills	98%	75%
Judicial Temperament	98%	83%
Administrative Performance	98%	86%

Reading This Data

WARNER, RANDALL	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS		
Appointed to Maricopa County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
Superior Court: 2007	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	98%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	99%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%
WELTY, JOSEPH	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	SSION RESULTS	
Appointed to Maricopa County	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
Superior Court: 2007	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	Litigant/Witness
	In diala Danfanna ana Communia	Dachancac	Daamanaaa
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	100%	<u>Responses</u> N/A
	_	<u> </u>	
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A
	Legal Ability Integrity	100% 100%	N/A 100%
	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills	100% 100% 100%	N/A 100% 100%
WILLETT, EILEEN	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament	100% 100% 100% 99% 100%	N/A 100% 100% 100%
	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance	100% 100% 100% 99% 100% SSION RESULTS	N/A 100% 100% 100%
WILLETT, EILEEN Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS	100% 100% 100% 99% 100% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards	N/A 100% 100% 100% 100%
Appointed to Maricopa County	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	100% 100% 100% 99% 100% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards	N/A 100% 100% 100% 100%
Appointed to Maricopa County	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J	100% 100% 100% 99% 100% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Sta	N/A 100% 100% 100% 100%
Appointed to Maricopa County	Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMIS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" J 0 Commissioners Voted "Does No	100% 100% 100% 99% 100% SSION RESULTS Judicial Standards t Meet" Judicial Standards	N/A 100% 100% 100% 100% andards Litigant/Witness

Superior Court. 1999	O Commissioners voted Does Not meet Judicial Standards		
		<u>Attorney</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness</u>
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	97%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	92%
	Communication Skills	98%	91%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	94%
	Administrative Performance	100%	94%
	Administrative i chomianee	10070	J+70